

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider the Adoption of a General Order and Procedures to Implement the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006.

R.06-10-005 (Filed October 5, 2006)

AT&T CALIFORNIA'S APPLICATION FOR REHEARING OF DECISION 07-10-013 (FILED OCTOBER 5, 2007)

James B. Young David J. Miller AT&T Services Legal Department 525 Market Street, Room 2018 San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: (415) 778-1393 Fax: (281) 664-9478 davidjmiller@att.com

SUBJECT INDEX

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	DISCUSSION	2
III	.CONCLUSION	6

AT&T California, pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 1731(b) and Rule of Practice and Procedure 16.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"), hereby applies for rehearing of Commission Decision 07-10-013, filed October 5, 2007 (hereinafter, "Decision"). As explained below, the Decision's requirement that each franchise holder report the number of subscribers by census tract is unlawful.

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 ("DIVCA" or "the Act") repeatedly emphasizes that the Commission has very limited authority over video services and video service providers. In two separate provisions, DIVCA clarifies that the Commission's broader authority over public utilities does not apply to video service providers. Section 5810(a)(3) states that "video service providers *are not public utilities* or common carriers," and section 5820(c) confirms that "[t]he holder of a state [video] franchise *shall not be deemed a public utility* as a result of providing video service...."

Consistent with this intent, the plain and express language of DIVCA carefully limits the Commission's authority:

Neither the commission nor any local franchising entity or other local entity of the state may ... *impose any requirement* on any holder of a state franchise *except* as *expressly provided* in [DIVCA].³

DIVCA sections 5920 and 5960 set forth *the* reporting requirements of DIVCA. Neither of these sections, nor any other section, of DIVCA requires each franchise holder to report the number of subscribers by census tract, thus the Decision's imposition of such a requirement is unlawful.

¹ Pub. Util Code § 5810(a)(3) (emphasis added). All statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

² § 5820(c) (emphasis added).

³ § 5840(a) (emphasis added).

In attempting to justify this additional reporting requirement, the Decision opines,

We disagree that the imposition of further reporting requirements violates DIVCA. However, we agree generally with the comments of current or potential providers of video programming and broadband services that DIVCA intends video programming and broadband services to be offered in a competitive environment, and that the Commission should avoid imposing additional data requirements that impose a heavy burden on service providers yet do not assist the Commission in carrying out its role.⁴

In other words, the Decision concludes DIVCA authorizes additional reporting requirements so long as they (1) "assist the Commission" and (2) do not "impose a heavy burden on service providers." This conclusion is contrary to the plain language of DIVCA. Nowhere does DIVCA allow the Commission to impose reporting requirements as long as they "assist the Commission" and do not impose "a heavy burden." To the contrary, DIVCA plainly states that the Commission may not "impose any requirement on any holder of a state franchise except as expressly provided in [DIVCA]." 5

II. **DISCUSSION**

The Decision would require each franchise holder to report the number of households in each census tract of its service area that subscribe to its video service,⁶ claiming this "data will be useful for ensuring enforcement of the non-discrimination and build-out provisions of Section 5890," and that "video subscriber data will be necessary information for the Commission so that it can determine whether to initiate action on its own motion to enforce Section 5890(a)." To

⁴ Decision, *mimeo*, pp. 21-22.

⁵ § 5840(a) (emphasis added).

⁶ See Decision, mimeo, pp. 22 (Ordering Paragraph 2.c).

⁷ *Id.* at 22-23.

⁸ *Id.* at 24.

the contrary, this new reporting requirement violates DIVCA and will not assist the Commission in enforcing section 5890(a).

First, as discussed above, DIVCA does not authorize the Commission to impose reporting requirements it merely deems to be "useful" or even "necessary" in ensuring enforcement of the Act. Instead, DIVCA expressly prohibits the Commission from "impos[ing] any requirement on any holder of a state franchise except as expressly provided in [DIVCA]."

DIVCA even enumerates the reporting requirements the Commission may impose, and subscriber data is not one of them. Indeed, prior to its passage, the Legislature removed from DIVCA a provision that would have required reporting of "[t]he number of households in each census tract that use video service provided by the holder or its affiliates." Such rejection by the Legislature is a "most persuasive" indication that the legislation should not be interpreted to include the omitted provision. Thus, the Decision's imposition of a new requirement to report subscribers by census tract is contrary to the plain language of DIVCA and the clear intent of the Legislature.

Second, the Commission's authority to regulate public utilities does not allow it to impose a video subscriber reporting requirement, or any other requirement, on video service providers. Again, DIVCA plainly provides that "video service providers are not public utilities

⁹ § 5840(a) (emphasis added).

¹⁰ §§ 5920, 5960.

¹¹ Compare AB2987 as amended in Senate August 23, 2006, p. 15, § 5840(n)(1)(F) (available at <http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_2951-3000/ab_2987_bill_20060823_amended_sen.pdf) with AB2987 as amended in Senate August 28, 2006, pp. 18 (text of § 5840(n)(1)(F) stricken as deleted), 41-42 (§ 5960(b)(1) and (2) added), (available at http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_2951-3000/ab_2987_bill_20060828_amended_sen.pdf).

¹² Rich v. State Board of Optometry (1965), 235 Cal.App.2d 591, 607 (citations omitted).

or common carriers,"¹³ and that "[t]he holder of a state [video] franchise *shall not be deemed a public utility* as a result of providing video service...."¹⁴

Third, contrary to the Decision's reasoning, subscriber data by tract are not "necessary information for the Commission so that it can determine whether to initiate action on its own motion to enforce Section 5890(a)." DIVCA prohibits income-based discrimination in offering access to potential subscribers, it does not require a certain composition of actual subscribers.

Section 5890(a) provides (emphasis added),

A cable operator or video service provider that has been granted a state franchise under this division may not discriminate against or deny *access to* service to any group of *potential* residential subscribers because of the income of the residents in the local area in which the group resides.

The very next subsection, 5890(b), provides that franchise holders such as AT&T meet the requirements of 5890(a) if certain milestones are satisfied¹⁶ regarding the percentage of households "with access to the holder's video service."¹⁷ The Act defines "access" to mean "that the holder is capable of providing video service at the household address...regardless of whether any customer has ordered service..."¹⁸ Accordingly, DIVCA requires the reporting of the number of households "offered" video service, ¹⁹ and the number of low-income households "offered" video service.²⁰ Thus, DIVCA's plain language makes clear that its non-discrimination requirement applies to "access," not subscriber composition. Of course this reflects two

¹³ § 5810(a)(3) (emphasis added).

¹⁴ § 5820(c) (emphasis added).

¹⁵ Decision, p. 24.

¹⁶ The holder must also meet certain community center requirements. § 5890(b)(3).

¹⁷ § 5890(b)(2) (emphasis added). This provision makes plain that franchise holders have three years to meet DIVCA's non-discriminatory access requirement. Thus, any related reporting before then is unnecessary.

¹⁸ § 5890(i)(4).

¹⁹ § 5960(b)(2)(A)(ii).

²⁰ § 5960(b)(3)(ii).

important realities: (1) no rational new entrant would make the sizable capital investment necessary to provide access to video service in a particular area, and then refuse to sell it; and (2) franchise holders cannot force customers to actually subscribe to their service.

Fourth, it would be particularly inappropriate to require new entrants to report geographically granular subscriber data. Such data are highly proprietary trade secrets. As new entrants sign up customers, the number and location of those customers can easily be used by incumbent competitors to identify a new entrant's rollout plans. The incumbent can then target promotional offerings and deny the benefits of such offerings to its broader customer base. Even if done on an "aggregated" basis, reporting of such data for geographic areas where there is only one franchise holder would reveal that holder's detailed subscriber data. Nonetheless, the Decision only provides that new entrant video subscriber data "may" be accorded proprietary treatment.²¹

Fifth, compliance with the nondiscrimination and build-out requirements of section 5890 is measured at the level of the provider's entire service area.²² Because the requirements do not apply on a census tract basis, the Commission has no need to see subscriber data at the census tract level.

²¹ Decision, p. 24.

²² Providers are already required to report the total number of video subscribers annually, per G.O. 169. General Order 169, p. 19 (section D(2)).

III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

As set forth above, AT&T California requests the Decision be corrected by removing the unlawful provisions that impose the additional requirement to report subscriber data by census tract.

Respectfully submitted,

/s

James B. Young
David J. Miller
AT&T Services Legal Department
525 Market Street, Room 2018
San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: (415) 778-1393 Fax: (281) 664-9478 davidjmiller@att.com

DATED: November 5, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Agnes Ng, certify that I have this day caused a true copy of the original attached AT&T CALIFORNIA'S APPLICATION FOR REHEARING OF DECISION 07-10-013 in R.06-10-005 to be served by electronic mail, US mail, or hand delivery on all parties on the service list for this proceeding.

Dated this 5th day of November 2007 at San Francisco, California 94105.

/s/ Agnes Ng

AT&T Services, Inc.

525 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105 WILLIAM H. WEBER ATTORNEY AT LAW CBEYOND COMMUNICATIONS 320 INTERSTATE NORTH PARKWAY ATLANTA GA 30339

DAVID C. RODRIGUEZ STRATEGIC COUNSEL 523 WEST SIXTH STREET, SUITE 1128 LOS ANGELES CA 90014

GERALD R. MILLER CITY OF LONG BEACH 333 WEST OCEAN BLVD. LONG BEACH CA 90802

CYNTHIA J. KURTZ CITY MANAGER CITY OF PASADENA 117 E. COLORADO BLVD., 6TH FLOOR PASADENA CA 91105

ESTHER NORTHRUP COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, LLC 5159 FEDERAL BLVD. SAN DIEGO CA 92105

ELAINE M. DUNCAN ATTORNEY AT LAW VERIZON 711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

BARRY FRASER CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO 875 STEVENSON STREET, 5TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103

WILLIAM L. LOWERY MILLER & VAN EATON, LLP 580 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1600 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FASSIL FENIKILE AT&T CALIFORNIA 525 MARKET STREET, ROOM 1925 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

TOM SELHORST AT&T CALIFORNIA 525 MARKET STREET, 2023 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105 ANN JOHNSON VERIZON 600 HIDDEN RIDGE IRVING TX 75038

MAGGLE HEALY CITY OF REDONDO BEACH 415 DIAMOND STREET REDONDO BEACH CA 90277

TRACEY L. HAUSE ADMIN SERVICES DIRECTOR CITY OF ARCADIA 240 W. HUNTINGTON DRIVE ARCADIA CA 91007

ROB WISHNER CITY OF WALNUT 21201 LA PUENTE ROAD WALNUT CA 91789

BILL NUSBAUM THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK 711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

REGINA COSTA THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK 711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

WILLIAM L. LOWERY MILLER & VAN EATON, LLP 400 MONTGOMERY ST., SUITE 501 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103

DAVID J. MILLER ATTORNEY AT LAW AT&T CALIFORNIA 525 MARKET STREET, ROOM 2018 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

SYREETA GIBBS AT&T CALIFORNIA 525 MARKET STREET, 19TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

ENRIQUE GALLARDO LATINO ISSUES FORUM 160 PINE STREET, SUITE 700 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 MARK P. SCHREIBER ATTORNEY AT LAW COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP 201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

SEAN P. BEATTY ATTORNEY AT LAW COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP 201 CALIFORNIA ST., 17TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

ALEXIS K. WODTKE STAFF ATTORNEY CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA 520 S. EL CAMINO REAL, STE. 340 SAN MATEO CA 94402

DOUGLAS GARRETT COX COMMUNICATIONS 2200 POWELL STREET, STE. 1035 EMERYVILLE CA 94608

LESLA LEHTONEN VP LEGAL & REGY AFFAIRS CALIFORNIA CABLE TELEVISION ASSOCIATION 360 22ND STREET, NO. 750 OAKLAND CA 94612

KENECHUKWU OKOCHA THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR BERKELEY CA 94704

PHILIP KAMLARZ CITY OF BERKELEY 2180 MILVIA STREET BERKELEY CA 94704

THALIA N.C. GONZALEZ LEGAL COUNSEL THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR BERKELEY CA 94704

GREG R. GIERCZAK EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SURE WEST TELEPHONE 200 VERNON STREET PO BOX 969 ROSEVILLE CA 95678 PATRICK M. ROSVALL ATTORNEY AT LAW COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP 201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

ALLEN S. HAMMOND, IV PROFESSOR OF LAW SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY SHCOOL OF LAW 500 EL CAMINO REAL SANTA CLARA CA 94305

ANITA C. TAFF-RICE ATTORNEY AT LAW 1547 PALOS VERDES MALL, SUITE 298 WALNUT CREEK CA 94597

IZETTA C.R. JACKSON OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTY CITY OF OAKLAND
1 FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA, 10TH FLR.
OAKLAND CA 94612

MARIA POLITZER LEGAL DEPARTMENT ASSOCIATE CALIFORNIA CABLE TELEVISION ASSOCIATION 360 22ND STREET, NO. 750 OAKLAND CA 94612

MARK RUTLEDGE TELECOMS FELLOW THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLR. BERKELEY CA 94704

ROBERT GNAIZDA POLICY DIRECTOR/GENERAL COUNSEL THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLOOR BERKELEY CA 94704

WILLIAM HUGHES ASST CITY ATTY CITY OF SAN JOSE 200 EAST SANTA CLARA STREET 16TH FLOOR SAN JOSE CA 95113-1900

PATRICK WHITNELL 1400 K STREET, 4TH FLOOR SACRAMENTO CA 95814 MARIE C. MALLIETT THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA 2870 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100 SACRAMENTO CA 95833-3509

GREGORY T. DIAMOND 7901 LOWRY BLVD. DENVER CO 80230

LONNIE ELDRIDGE DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 200 N. MAIN STREET LOS ANGELES CA 90012

ROY MORALES CHIEF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CITY OF LOS ANGELES 200 N. SPRING STREET, 2ND FLOOR LOS ANGELES CA 90012

GREG FUENTES 11041 SANTA MONICA BLVD., NO.629 LOS ANGELES CA 90025

MICHAEL J. FRIEDMAN VICE PRESIDENT TELECOMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT CORP. 5757 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 635 LOS ANGELES CA 90036

STEVEN LASTOMIRSKY DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF SAN DIEGO 1200 THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR SAN DIEGO CA 92101

AARON C. HARP OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH 3300 NEWPORT BLVD NEWPORT BEACH CA 92658-8915

REGINA COSTA RESEARCH DIRECTOR THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK 711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 KEVIN SAVILLE ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL CITIZENS/FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS 2378 WILSHIRE BLVD. MOUND MN 55364

ALOA STEVENS DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT&EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS PO BOX 708970 SANDY UT 84070-8970

RICHARD CHABRAN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY POLICY 1000 ALAMEDA STREET, SUITE 240 LOS ANGELES CA 90012

WILLIAM IMPERIAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS REG. OFFICER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY 200 N. MAIN STREET LOS ANGELES CA 90012

JONATHAN L. KRAMER ATTORNEY AT LAW KRAMER TELECOM LAW FIRM 2001 S. BARRINGTON AVE., SUITE 306 LOS ANGELES CA 90025

ANDRES F. IRLANDO VICE PRESIDENT VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC. 112 LAKEVIEW CANYON ROAD THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362

SUSAN WILSON DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY RIVERSIDE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 3900 MAIN STREET, 5TH FLOOR RIVERSIDE CA 92522

CHRISTINE MAILLOUX ATTORNEY AT LAW THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK 711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

WILLIAM R. NUSBAUM ATTORNEY AT LAW THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK 711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 WILLIAM K. SANDERS DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE,ROOM 234 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4682

RANDLOPH W. DEUTSCH SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 555 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 2000 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

RHONDA J. JOHNSON VP-REGULATORY AFFAIRS AT&T CALIFORNIA 525 MARKET STREET, ROOM 1923 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

PETER A. CASCIATO A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 355 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 410 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107

JOSE E. GUZMAN, JR. NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT LLP 50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799

GRANT GUERRA PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PO BOX 7442, 77 BEALE ST, B10A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7442

DAVID HANKIN ASTOUND BROADBAND, LLC 1400 FASHION ISLAND BLVD., SUITE 100 SAN MATEO CA 94404

PETER DRAGOVICH ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER CITY OF CONCORD 1950 PARKSIDE DRIVE, MS 01/A CONCORD CA 94519

STEPHANIE CHEN LEGAL ASSOCIATE THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY STREET, 2ND FLOOR BERKELEY CA 94704 MALCOLM YEUNG STAFF ATTORNEY ASIAN LAW CAUCUS 939 MARKET ST., SUITE 201 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103

GREG STEPHANICICH RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON 44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 3800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104-4811

MARGARET L. TOBIAS TOBIAS LAW OFFICE 460 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107

WALTER W. HANSELL COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP 201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

KATIE NELSON DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP 505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533

GRANT KOLLING SENIOR ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF PALO ALTO 250 HAMILTON AVENUE, 8TH FLOOR PALO ALTO CA 94301

MARK T. BOEHME ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF CONCORD 1950 PARKSIDE DRIVE CONCORD CA 94510

BOBAK ROSHAN LEGAL ASSOCIATE THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY STREET, 2ND FLOOR BERKELEY CA 94704

SCOTT MCKOWN C/O CONT OF MARIN ISTD MARIN TELECOMMUNICATION AGENCY 371 BEL MARIN KEYS BOULEVARD NOVATO CA 94941 BARRY F. MCCARTHY, ESQ. ATTORNEY AT LAW MCCARTHY & BARRY LLP 100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, SUITE 501 SAN JOSE CA 95113

CHARLES BORN MANAGER, GOVERNMENT & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS OF CALIFORNIA 9260 E. STOCKTON BLVD. ELK GROVE CA 95624

KELLY E. BOYD NOSSAMAN,GUTHNER,KNOX AND ELLIOTT 915 L STREET, SUITE 1000 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

SUE BUSKE THE BUSKE GROUP 3001 J STREET, SUITE 201 SACRAMENTO CA 95816

APRIL MULQUEEN CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 5119 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

LAURA E. GASSER CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4107 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

MICHAEL MORRIS CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE AREA 3-F SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

SINDY J. YUN CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4300 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 5212 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214 TIM HOLDEN SIERRA NEVADA COMMUNICATIONS PO BOX 281 STANDARD CA 95373

JOE CHICOINE MANAGER, STATE GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS PO BOX 340 ELK GROVE CA 95759

ROBERT A. RYAN COUNTY COUNSEL COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO 700 H STREET, SUITE 2650 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

ALIK LEE CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4101 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

JANE WHANG CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 5029 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

LILY CHOW CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE AREA 3-F SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

ROBERT LEHMAN CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 4102 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

STEVEN KOTZ CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE ROOM 2251 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

WILLIAM JOHNSTON CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 VAN NESS AVENUE AREA 3-F SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214 DELANEY HUNTER CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 770 L STREET, SUITE 1050 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

RANDY CHINN CHIEF CONSULTANT SENATE ENERGY UTILITIES & COMMUNICATIONS STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 4038 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 EDWARD RANDOLPH ASM LEVINE'S OFFICE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE/UTILITIES AND COMMERC STATE CAPITOL ROOM 5135 SACRAMENTO CA 95814